CLERK'S OFFICE (1.8. DIST. COURT AT ROANOKE, VA FILED

MAY 1 2 2005

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COUR FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGIN ROANOKE DIVISION

| T | MAI | r a guu | J |
|---------------|--------|--------------------|-------|
| (AJOHN BY: | F. COF | CORAN. TY CLERK | GLERK |

| JOSE JAIME-CARRANZA, |) | |
|---------------------------|---|---------------------------------|
| Petitioner, |) | Civil Action No. 7:05-CV- 00294 |
| • |) | |
| v. |) | MEMORANDUM OPINION |
| |) | |
| UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, |) | |
| |) | By: Samuel G. Wilson |
| Respondent. |) | United States District Judge |

Petitioner Jose Jaime-Carranza brings this motion to correct his sentence pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2255, claiming that the recent Supreme Court decision in <u>United States v. Booker</u>, 125 S. Ct. 738 (Jan. 12, 2005), renders his sentence illegal. However, the Court did not make its decision in <u>Booker</u> applicable to cases on collateral review; therefore, the court will file and dismiss this motion pursuant to Rule 4(b) of the Rules Governing Section 2255 Proceedings.

I.

Carranza challenges his 46-month sentence for illegal re-entry into the United States² under the Supreme Court's recent decision in <u>United States v. Booker</u>, 125 S. Ct. 738 (Jan. 12, 2005). Though the Court held that <u>Booker</u> applies to the Federal Sentencing Guidelines and to cases on direct review, it did not make <u>Booker</u> retroactive to cases on collateral review. <u>Booker</u>, 125 S. Ct. at 769. Therefore, the Court's decision in <u>Booker</u> is not applicable to Carranza's

¹Carranza claims that the Supreme Court held that the sentencing guidelines are unconstitutional and not mandatory; however, he cites no case law in his petition. Therefore, the court construes Carranza's claims under Booker.

²Carranza pleaded guilty, and the court entered judgment March 7, 2003. Carranza did not appeal his conviction.

motion under § 2255 \P 6(3), and the court dismisses his petition.³

II.

For the reasons stated, the court files and dismisses Carranza's § 2255 motion pursuant to Rule 4(b) of the Rules Governing Section 2255 Proceedings.

ENTER: This 13th day of May, 2005.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

³Additionally, Carranza's petition is untimely. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2255, a petitioner must file his motion within one-year from the date his conviction becomes final. See 28 U.S.C. § 2255 ¶ 6(1). Carranza's conviction became final on March 21, 2003, ten days after the court entered its judgment, see Fed. R. App. P. 4(b), meaning he had until March 22, 2004, to file a § 2255 petition. Carranza did not meet this deadline, and he does not meet any of the conditions allowing for a later commencement of the statutory period. See 28 U.S.C. § 2255 ¶ 6(1).